

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/057,261	04/08/1998	TIMOTHY P. O'HAGAN	TELNP0157US	6228
25022	7590 08/27/2002			
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 1900 EAST 9TH STREET, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 24TH FLOOR, CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER	
			KNEPPER, DAVID D	
CLEVELANI), On 44114		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2654		
			DATE MAIL FD: 08/27/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Qr

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
[™] Advisory Action	09/057,261	O'HAGAN, TIMOTHY P.	
• '	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David D. Knepper	2654	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amo	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extensi unt of the fee. The appropriate extens	ion sion
fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ce later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b).	ling date of the final rejection, even if	or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying th	е
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without cancelingNOTE: .	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendmen	t
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:	•		
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10. Other:	Da	ind D. Kyper	
		David D. Knepper Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2654	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant mischaracherizes the state of the art as teaching that Hidden Markov Models (HMMs) are limited in use such that they can only "decode speech". To the contrary, HMMs.are taught in Barclay as defining speech recognition vocabulary (lexicon) in column 2 which is further taught as running on a laptop or other such small computer. The term "grammar and vocabulary" used by Barclay in column 3 does not exclude the use of phoneme based vocabulary. Applicant's argument contradicts the facts presented by Barclay in column 1-2 that teach that it is obvious to use HMMs to define such a vocabulary.